27

28

1	Lawrence J. Semenza, III, Esq., Bar No. 7174 Email: ljs@semenzarickard.com Katie L. Cannata, Esq., Bar No. 14848 Email: klc@semenzarickard.com SEMENZA RICKARD LAW 10161 Park Run Drive, Suite 150	
2		
3		
4	Las Vegas, Nevada 89145	
5	Telephone: (702) 835-6803 Facsimile: (702) 920-8669	
6	Attorneys for Defendant/Counterclaimant	
7	MGM Grand Hotel, LLC and Defendant MGM Resorts International	
8		
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
11	DWIGHT MANLEY,	Case No. 2:22-cv-01906-MMD-EJY
12	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND ORDER TO
13	,	EXTEND DISCOVERY DEADLINE
14	V.	AND STATUS REPORT REGARDING DISCOVERY
15	MGM RESORTS INTERNATIONAL; MGM GRAND HOTEL, LLC,	(Fifth Request)
16	Defendants.	
17		
18	MGM GRAND HOTEL, LLC, a Nevada	
19	limited liability company,	
20	Counterclaimant,	
21	v.	
22	DWIGHT MANLEY, an individual,	
23	Counter-Defendant.	
2425		
	Pursuant to LR IA 6-1 and 6-2, Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant Dwight Manley ("Plainti	

Pursuant to LR IA 6-1 and 6-2, Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant Dwight Manley ("Plaintiff"), Defendant/Counterclaimant MGM Grand Hotel, LLC and Defendant MGM Resorts International (together, "Defendants"), hereby submit this Stipulation to Extend the Discovery Deadline (Fifth

Request) and Status Report Regarding Discovery.

As the Court knows, the discovery deadline in this matter expired on September 30, 2024. On October 1, 2024, the parties filed a Stipulation to Extend Dispositive Motion and Joint Pre-Trial Memo Deadlines (Fourth Request) (the "Fourth Stipulation"). [ECF No. 112.] As stated therein, the parties sought to extend the dispositive motion and joint pre-trial memo deadlines to December 30, 2024 and January 31, 2025, respectively. [Id.] The Court was further informed that while both parties acknowledged that certain discovery remained outstanding, they had yet to reach an agreement regarding an extension of the deadline and/or the discovery to be conducted during that period. [Id.] Thus, the parties agreed to notify the Court concerning the agreed to (and/or disputed) parameters for completing discovery in this case, as well as a proposed discovery cut-off date, within two (2) weeks (i.e. by October 15, 2024.) The Court subsequently granted the parties' Fourth Stipulation. [ECF No. 113.]

Since the submission of their Fourth Stipulation, the parties have met and conferred as to what discovery remains in this case, whether such discovery is appropriate and a proposed discovery cut-off date. Pursuant to those discussions, the parties have agreed to an extension of the discovery deadline up to and including November 30, 2024. The parties' requested extension will not impact the previously continued dispositive motion or pre-trial memo deadlines. [See ECF No. 112.] Rather, the proposed extension will ensure that the parties have sufficient time to complete discovery before the dispositive motion deadline.

With regard to what discovery remains to be completed, the parties' respective positions are as follows:

Manley's Proposed Remaining Discovery

- 1. Remaining follow up discovery regarding third-party subpoenas to telephone carriers and the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department ("LVMPD").
- 2. FRCP 30(b)(6) deposition(s) of Defendants.
- 3. Requests for admission to Defendants concerning the authentication of documents and certain issues of fact presented in this case.
- 4. Possible depositions involving individuals who were identified in prior incident

Defendants have no objection to Manley's proposed follow up discovery relating to the LVMPD and telephone carrier subpoenas. Defendants similarly do not object to FRCP 30(b)(6) depositions of their designee(s), subject to a further meet and confer conference concerning certain topics identified by Manley. While Defendants do not consent to Manley propounding additional requests for admission, they will work with Manley to determine what additional requests for admission are appropriate and once received respond to them accordingly. Finally, Defendants object to any discovery involving and/or concerning individuals identified in prior incident reports on the grounds that any such discovery would be inappropriate.

Defendants' Proposed Remaining Discovery

- 1. Subpoenas duces tecum to telephone carriers for purposes of requesting call logs associated with the following individuals' telephone numbers: (1) Manley's former private investigator, Thomas Fletcher ("Fletcher"), (2) Manley, and (3) Jerilyn Koch.
- Subpoena duces tecum and subpoena for deposition upon the former LVMPD
 officer who provided Fletcher access to the LVMPD case file concerning the
 alleged incident.
- 3. A continued deposition of Manley for purposes of addressing outstanding discovery issues.²

Manley has no objection to Defendants conducting their proposed remaining discovery.

To the extent that the parties are unable to agree upon the proposed remaining discovery set forth above, those issues shall be brought before the Court for adjudication. As such, both parties reserve their right to file appropriate motions with the Court, if necessary.

¹ As stated in the parties' Fourth Stipulation, on September 27, 2024, Defendants produced prior incident reports consistent with the Court's ruling on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel and Defendants' corresponding Motion for Protective Order. (*See* ECF No. 65 and ECF No. 94.)

² Defendants will determine whether it would be appropriate to conduct Manley's continued deposition via remote means.

ase 2:22-cv-01906-MMD-EJY Document 117 Filed 10/15/24 Page 4 of 4

Proposed

November 30, 2024